

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 9, 12, 15-16, 21-25, 28, 31, and 34-35 are amended herein. Claims 1, 20, 39 and 40 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 2-19 and 21-38 remain in the application. No new matter has been added. Consideration and examination is respectfully requested.

1. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER (OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 2, 5-14, 16-19, 21, 24-33, and 35-38):

In the first paragraph under "Allowable Subject Matter" on page 4 of the Office Action dated 21 April 2004 (Paper No./Mail Date 04072004) hereinafter referred to as the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claims 2, 5-14, 16-19, 21, 24-33, and 35-38 were objected to as "being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." Applicant respectively traverses the objection.

However, to overcome the objection of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claims 2, 5-6, 9, 12, and 16 have been rewritten so as to include the limitations of their base claim (claim 1) as written prior to the present Amendment. There were no intervening claims. Thus, Applicant has overcome the objection of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, and claims 2, 5-6, 9, 12, and 16 are allowable.

Also, to overcome the objection of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claims 21, 24-25, 28, 31, and 35 have been rewritten so as to include the limitations of their base claim (claim 20) as written prior to the present Amendment. There were no intervening claims. Thus, Applicant has overcome the objection of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, and claims 21, 24-25, 28, 31, and 35 are allowable.

In addition, because dependent claim 7 depends from independent claim 6 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claim 7 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 8 depends from independent claim 6 via dependent claim 7, both of which are allowable, it follows that dependent claim 8 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 10 depends from independent claim 9 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claim 10 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 11 depends from independent claim 9 via dependent claim 10, both of which are allowable, it follows that dependent claim 11 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 13 depends from independent claim 12 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claim 13 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 14 depends from independent claim 12 via dependent claim 13, both of which are allowable, it follows that dependent claim 14 is also allowable.

Because dependent claims 17-19, each depend from independent claim 16 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claims 17-19 are also allowable.

In addition, because dependent claim 26 depends from independent claim 25 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claim 26 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 27 depends from independent claim 25 via dependent claim 26, both of which are allowable, it follows that dependent claim 27 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 29 depends from independent claim 28 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claim 29 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 30 depends from independent claim 28 via dependent claim 29, both of which are allowable, it follows that dependent claim 30 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 32 depends from independent claim 31 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claim 32 is also allowable.

Because dependent claim 33 depends from independent claim 31 via dependent claim 32, both of which are allowable, it follows that dependent claim 33 is also allowable.

Because dependent claims 36-38, each depend from independent claim 35 which is allowable, it follows that dependent claims 36-38 are also allowable.

2. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 39 & 40 UNDER U.S.C. § 102(b):

In the second paragraph on page 2 under the section titled "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102" of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claims 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Muramatsu in Japanese Patent Number 08-122423 entitled "Electronic Measuring Apparatus" hereinafter *Muramatsu*. Applicant respectfully traverses. However, claims 39 and 40 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

3. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3-4, 15, 20, 22-23, & 34 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the third paragraph on page 3 under the section titled "Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103" of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claims 1, 3-4, 15, 20, 22-23, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Muramatsu* in view of *Iida* in U.S. Patent Number 6,280,105 entitled "Printing System and Printing Control Method" hereinafter *Iida*. Applicant respectfully traverses. However, claims 1 and 20 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

Regarding Rejection of Claims 3-4 and 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

With respect to the rejection of claims 3-4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), it is noted that dependent claims 3-4 and 15 now depend from independent claim 2 and that, as such, dependent claims 3-4 and 15 have all the features described above for claim 2 as elements. Also as noted above, to overcome the objection of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claim 2 has been rewritten so as to include the limitations of its base claim (claim 1) as written prior to the present Amendment resulting in claim 2 being allowable. Thus, claims 3-4 and 15 are also allowable as they depend from an allowable claim (claim 2).


Regarding Rejection of Claims 22-23 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

With respect to the rejection of claims 22-23 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), it is noted that dependent claims 22-23 and 34 now depend from independent claim 21 and that, as such, dependent claims 22-23 and 34 have all the features described above for claim 21 as elements. Also as noted above, to overcome the objection of the Office Action of 21 April 2004, claim 21 has been rewritten so as to include the limitations of its base claim (claim 20) as written prior to the present Amendment resulting in claim 21 being allowable. Thus, claims 22-23 and 34 are also allowable as they depend from an allowable claim (claim 21).

4. IN CONCLUSION:

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. Applicant believes that all claims pending in the Present Application as described above are allowable and that all other issues raised by the Examiner have been rectified. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider his rejections and to grant an early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

by 

Morley C. Tobey, Jr.

Reg. No. 43,955

July 21, 2004
Loveland, CO 80537
(970) 669-1266